UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/832,870	04/12/2001	Bok Hyun Pack	LT-002	1379

34610	7590	07/27/2006

FLESHNER & KIM, LLP
P.O. BOX 221200
CHANTILLY, VA 20153

EXAMINER
LAMBRECHT, CHRISTOPHER M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2623	

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/832,870	PACK ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher M. Lambrecht	2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _13 March 2006_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _21-65_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _21-65_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 21-65 have been considered but are moot in view

of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section
> 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the
> subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary
> skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

1. **Claims 21-39, 61, 62, and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable
    over U.S. Patent No. 5,929,849 to Kikinis, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,818,935 to Maa,
    and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,778,181 to Hidary et al.**

Regarding claim **21**, Kikinis teaches a method for displaying visual information, comprising:

receiving a digital signal including channel data and product information containing at least one URL

(See Fig. 2C, Fig. 3A, Abstract, Col. 3 lines 10-23, and Col. 6 lines 50-63, Col. 9 lines 24-67, Col. 10

lines 1-17); controlling a screen to simultaneously display the channel data and URL (See Fig. 2C,

Abstract, Col. 3 lines 10-23, Col. 8 lines 65-67, Col. 9 lines 1-3); receiving a user-initiated signal

indicating selection of the URL (See Abstract, Fig. 3A Step 101, Col. 9 lines 24-67, Col. 10 lines 1-

17); and accessing information from a network address corresponding to the URL, wherein the URL

corresponds to a product appearing in the displayed channel data (See Abstract, Fig. 3A Step 111

Col. 3 lines 10-23, Col. 9 lines 24-67, Col. 10 lines 1-17). Kikinis fails to disclose comparing and

storing the received product information only if it does not compare with previously stored

information; and the URL and either an icon image or a still image being displayed in a window in

response to activation of a web-surfing button. However, in similar endeavors, Hidary and Maa

teach disclose these features. Specifically, Maa discloses where a table displaying URLs and text

descriptions of URLs are displayed in response to the user pressing a button (See Fig. 3 and Col. 6

lines 7-52). Thus, in view of the teachings of Maa, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art the time the invention was made to modify Kikinis to have a URL and information

relating to the URL being displayed in a window in response to activation of a web-surfing button

so that a user could access URLs without typing the address (See Maa Col. 7 lines 43-50). Kikinis

modified with Maa above differs from the claimed invention in that text descriptions are displayed

in Maa's window and not images. However, Kikinis also teaches using icons to represent

information that can be associated with a URL (See Fig. 2A 57 BMW emblem and Col. 7 lines 48-

56). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to display a URL and either an icon image or a still image being in a window since icons

can be identified easily be users. Further, Hidary discloses the step of comparing and storing the

received product information only if it does not compare with previously stored information (fig.3,

col. 5 lines 16-33), which prevents the browser from fetching identical URLs transmitted in direct

succession (col. 5 lines 16-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art to modify the method of Kikinis and Maa to include comparing and storing the received product

information only if it does not compare with previously stored information, as taught by Hidary, to

prevent redundant processing at the receiver.

Regarding claim 22, Kikinis modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein the product

information is received in a packet which includes: a payload including the URL; and a header

containing an identifier which indicates that the packet is carrying product information (See Kikinis

Col. 5 lines 42-55, Col. 7 lines 18-27, Col. 10 lines 33-38 Product information is recorded in a

separate data region of the transport stream from video data. In an MPEG-2 transport stream these

separate data regions would be different types of streams. Streams are made up of packets. A

payload including the URL and a header containing an identifier (PID) would be inherent to an

MPEG-2 packet containing URL information).

Regarding claim **23**, Kikinis modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein the digital signal

includes a time code for synchronizing display of the URL with the channel data (See Kikinis Col. 9

lines 29-36 Tags linking URLs to images are a time code).

Regarding claim **24**, Kikinis modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein the product

information is included in a service information field of the digital signal (See Kikinis Col. 5 lines 42-

55, Col. 7 lines 18-27, Col. 10 lines 33-38 In an MPEG2 transport stream a separate data region

would be a service information field).

Regarding claim **25**, Kikinis modified with Maa and Hidary further teaches storing the product

information in a memory separate from the channel data (See Kikinis Col. 9 lines 29-63).

Regarding claim **26**, Kikinis modified with Maa and Hidary teaches controlling the screen to

simultaneously display the URL and the still image of the channel data in the window (See

Discussion of claim 21).

Regarding claim **27**, Kikinis modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein the URL is displayed

in association with a pointer which points to a product shown as the still image (See Kikinis Fig. 2C

Cursor 70 Col. 8 lines 1-22 The cursor is a pointer which the user uses to point to a product shown

in the still frame).

Regarding claim **28**, Kikinis modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein the URL is displayed

in association with a product which is highlighted as the still image (See Kikinis Col. 5 lines 18-27).

Regarding claim **29**, Kikinis modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein controlling includes: controlling the screen to display the image with the URL and channel data (See Kikinis Fig. 2A 57 BMW emblem and Col. 7 lines 48-56).

Regarding claim **30**, Kikinis modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein the image bears a resemblance to a product associated with the URL (See Kikinis Fig. 2A 57 BMW emblem and Col. 7 lines 48-56).

Regarding claim **31**, Kikinis modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein the image includes an icon associated with the product (See Kikinis Fig. 2A 57 BMW emblem and Col. 7 lines 48-56).

Regarding claim **32**, Kikinis modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein controlling includes controlling the screen to simultaneously display a plurality of URLs and a plurality of either icon images or still images in the window, wherein each of the URLs and each of the icon images or still images corresponds to a different product appearing in the displayed channel data (See Discussion of claim 21 and Kikinis Col. 6 lines 50-63, Col. 7 lines 10-17, Col. 9 lines 29-36).

Regarding claim **33**, Kikinis modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein the URLs are displayed in a scrollable list over the channel data (See Kikinis Fig. 2C Window 71 Col. 8 lines 1-22).

Regarding claim **34**, Kikinis modified with Maa teaches wherein the product information includes a product code which is displayed in association with the URL and channel data (See Kikinis Fig. 2C Emblem 57 and Col. 6 lines 50-63 An emblem is a product code: a symbol that represents a product).

Regarding claim **35**, Kikinis modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein the screen is a screen of a Web-TV (See Kikinis Fig. 1 and Col. 5 lines 28-67 Col. 6 lines 1-32).

Regarding claim **36**, Kikinis modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein the URL and channel data are displayed in response to activation of the web-surfing button (See discussion of claim 21).

Regarding claim **37**, Kikinis modified with Maa and Hidary further teaches controlling display of the information accessed from the network address (See Kikinis Col. 8 lines 1-22).

Regarding claim **38**, Kikinis modified with Maa and Hidary further teaches wherein the accessed information includes at least on of price information, product appearance information, a name, and a product code (See Kikinis Col. 2 lines 36-44, Col. 8 lines 23-37 The model name of a car is both a product code and a name).

Regarding claim **39**, Kikinis modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein controlling includes: controlling the screen to simultaneously display the URL and an infra-coded picture of the channel data in the window (See discussion of claim 21 and Kikinis Fig. 3A, Col. 9 lines 24-53, Col. 10 lines 5-17 MPEG frames are an infra-coded picture).

Regarding claim **61**, Kikinis teaches a controller for a Web-TV, comprising: a network interface which receives data streams of program information and product information containing at least one URL (See Fig. 1 Decoder/Tuner 13 and Col. 5 lines 28-48 The Decoder/Tuner is an interface to a cable network); a memory for storing the product information (See Fig. 1 Col. 6 lines 1-12 and Col. 9 lines 29-35); a frame composer which forms an item selection video frame for allowing viewer selection of a product associated with the URL (See Fig. 1 MPEG 25 and Col. 42-55); and a control circuit which controls a screen to simultaneously display the program information and URL, and to process a user-initiated signal indicating selection of the URL, wherein the network interface accesses web-page data associated with the selected URL and the control circuit controls display of the Web-page data on the screen (See Fig. 1 CPU 19, Fig. 3A, Abstract, Col. 5 lines 34-41, and Col.

9 lines 28-67, Col. 10 lines 1-17). Kikinis fails to disclose comparing and storing the received

product information only if it does not compare with previously stored information; and the URL

and either an icon image or a still image being displayed in a window in response to activation of a

web-surfing button. However, in a similar endeavor, Maa teaches where a table displaying URLs

and text descriptions of URLs are displayed in response to the user pressing a button (See Fig. 3 and

Col. 6 lines 7-52). Thus, in view of the teaches of Maa, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to modify Kikinis to have a URL and

information relating to the URL being displayed in a window in response to activation of a web-

surfing button so that a user could access URLs without typing the address (See Maa Col. 7 lines 43-

50). Kikinis modified with Maa above differs from the claimed invention in that text descriptions

are displayed in Maa's window and not images. However, Kikinis also teaches using icons to

represent information that can be associated with a URL (See Fig. 2A 57 BMW emblem and Col. 7

lines 48-56). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to display a URL and either an icon image or a still image being in a window

since icons can be identified easily be users. Further, Hidary discloses the step of comparing and

storing the received product information only if it does not compare with previously stored

information (fig.3, col. 5 lines 16-33), which prevents the browser from fetching identical URLs

transmitted in direct succession (col. 5 lines 16-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Kikinis and Maa to include comparing and storing

the received product information only if it does not compare with previously stored information, as

taught by Hidary, to prevent redundant processing at the receiver.

Regarding claim **62**, Kikinis modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein the data streams are

broadcast in a multi-casting format (See Kikinis Col. 3 lines 32-40 A TV broadcast is a multi-casting

format).

Regarding claim **65**, Kikinis modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein the control circuit

simultaneously displays the URL and one of the still image or an infra-coded picture of the program

information (See Discussion of claim 61 and Kikinis Fig. 3A, Col. 9 lines 24-53, Col. 10 lines 5-17

MPEG frames are an infra-coded picture).

2. **Claims 40-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis in view of U.S. Patent No. 6, 467,093 to Inoue et al., further in view of Maa, and further in view of Hidary.**

Regarding claim **40**, Kikinis teaches a television controller, comprising: a data separator which

separates a digital signal into channel data and service data including product information containing

at least one URL (See Fig. 1 Decoder Tuner 13, and MPEG 25, Fig. 2C, Fig. 3A, Abstract, Col. 3

lines 10-23, Col. 5 lines 42-55, Col. 6 lines 50-63, Col. 9 lines 24-67, Col. 10 lines 1-17); a control

circuit which controls a television screen to simultaneously display the channel data and URL, and to

process a user-initiated signal indicating selection of the URL (See Fig. 1 CPU 19, Fig. 3A Step 105

and Col. 5 lines 27-67, Col. 6 lines 1-31, Col. 9 lines 24-67, Col. 10 line 1-17); and a network

interface which accesses information from a network address corresponding to the URL, wherein

the URL corresponds to a product appearing in the displayed channel data (See Fig. 1 Modem 35,

ISDN 39, and Abstract, Col. 5 lines 42-55, Col. 6 lines 50-63). Kikinis fails to disclose comparing

and storing the received product information only if it does not compare with previously stored

information; and where the digital signal comprises product information and other forms of service

data and thus does not disclose a section filter which separates the product information from other

forms of service data. However, Kikinis does teach where product information is packaged in an

MPEG2 transport stream with product information in a separate data region than frame data (See

Col. 5 lines 42-55, Col. 7 lines 18-46). It is well known in the art that an MPEG transport stream

can have many different types of service data which are in separate data regions from frame data and

that these different types of data can be separated by a section filter as taught by Inoue (See Fig. 2,

Fig. 3 and Col. 7 lines 54-67, Col. 8 lines 1-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kikinis' television controller so

that it included a section filter as taught by Inoue so that different types of services could be

provided to the user (See Col. 7 lines 59-67). Kikinis modified with Inoue fails to disclose the URL

and either an icon image or a still image being displayed in a window in response to activation of a

web-surfing button. However, in a similar endeavor, Maa teaches where a table displaying URLs

and text descriptions of URLs are displayed in response to the user pressing a button (See Fig. 3 and

Col. 6 lines 7-52). Thus, in view of the teaches of Maa, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to further modify Kikinis to have a URL

and information relating to the URL being displayed in a window in response to activation of a web-

surfing button so that a user could access URLs without typing the address (See Maa Col. 7 lines 43-

50). Kikinis further modified with Maa above differs from the claimed invention in that text

descriptions are displayed in Maa's window and not images. However, Kikinis also teaches using

icons to represent information that can be associated with a URL (See Fig. 2A 57 BMW emblem and

Col. 7 lines 48-56). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to display a URL and either an icon image or a still image being in a window

since icons can be identified easily be users. Further, Hidary discloses the step of comparing and

storing the received product information only if it does not compare with previously stored

information (fig.3, col. 5 lines 16-33), which prevents the browser from fetching identical URLs

transmitted in direct succession (col. 5 lines 16-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Kikinis, Inoue, and Maa to include comparing and

storing the received product information only if it does not compare with previously stored

information, as taught by Hidary, to prevent redundant processing at the receiver.

Regarding claim **41**, Kikinis modified with Inoue modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein

the product information is in a packet which includes: a payload including the URL; and a header

containing an identifier indicating that the packet is carrying product information (See Kikinis Col. 5

lines 42-55, Col. 7 lines 18-27, Col. 10 lines 33-38 Product information is recorded in a separate data

region of the transport stream from video data. In an MPEG-2 transport stream these separate data

regions would be different types streams. Streams are made up of packets. A payload including the

URL and a header containing an identifier (PID) would be inherent to an MPEG-2 packet

containing URL information. See Inoue Fig. 2 Col. 7 lines 54-67, Col. 8 lines 1-45).

Regarding claim **42**, Kikinis modified with Inoue modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein

the section filter separates the product information from other types of information based on the

identifier included in the header (See Inoue Col. 7 lines 54-67, Col. 8 lines 1-45).

Regarding claim **43**, Kikinis modified with Inoue modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein

said other information includes at least one of electronic program guide information and program

specific information (See Inoue Fig. 2 and Col. 7 lines 54-67, Col. 8 lines 1-45).

Regarding claim **44**, Kikinis modified with Inoue modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein

the digital signal includes a time code for synchronizing display of the URL with the channel data

(See Kikinis Col. 9 lines 29-36 Tags linking URLs to images are a time code).

Regarding claim **45**, Kikinis modified with Inoue modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein the product information is included in a service information field of the digital signal (See Inoue Fig. 2 and Col. 7 lines 54-67, Col. 8 lines 1-45).

Regarding claim **46**, Kikinis modified with Inoue modified with Maa and Hidary further teaches a memory for storing the product information separately from the channel data (See Kikinis Col. 9 lines 29-63).

Regarding claim **47**, Kikinis modified with Inoue modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein the control circuit controls the screen to simultaneously display the URL and the still image of the channel data in the window (See discussion of claim 40).

Regarding claim **48**, Kikinis modified with Inoue modified with Maa and Hidary further teaches the controller comprising a graphics generator which generates a pointer, wherein the control circuit displays the URL in association with the pointer which points to a product shown as the still image (See Kikinis Fig. 1 VGA 35 Fig. 2C Cursor 70 Col. 5 lines 27-67, Col. 6 lines 1-31, Col. 8 lines 1-22 The cursor is a pointer which the user uses to point to a product shown in the still frame).

Regarding claim **49**, Kikinis modified with Inoue modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein the control circuit controls the display of the URL in association with a product which is highlighted as the still image (See Kikinis Col. 5 lines 18-27).

Regarding claim **50**, Kikinis modified with Inoue modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein the control circuit controls the screen to display an image with the URL and channel data (See Kikinis Fig. 2A 57 BMW emblem and Col. 7 lines 48-56).

Regarding claim **51**, Kikinis modified with Inoue modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein the image bears a resemblance to a product associated with the URL (See Kikinis Fig. 2A 57 BMW emblem and Col. 7 lines 48-56).

Regarding claim **52**, Kikinis modified with Inoue modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein the image includes an icon associated with the product (See Kikinis Fig. 2A 57 BMW emblem and Col. 7 lines 48-56).

Regarding claim **53**, Kikinis modified with Inoue modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein the control circuit controls the screen to simultaneously display a plurality of URLs and a plurality of either images or still images in the window, wherein each of the URLs and each of the icon images or still images corresponds to a different product appearing in the displayed channel data (See discussion of claim 41 and Kikinis Col. 6 lines 50-63, Col. 7 lines 10-17, Col. 9 lines 29-36).

Regarding claim **54**, Kikinis modified with Inoue modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein the URLs are displayed in a scrollable list over the channel data (See Kikinis Fig. 2C Window 71 Col. 8 lines 1-22).

Regarding claim **55**, Kikinis modified with Inoue modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein the product information includes a product code which is displayed in association with the URL and the channel data (See Kikinis Fig. 2C Emblem 57 and Col. 6 lines 50-63 An emblem is a product code: a symbol that represents a product).

Regarding claim **56**, Kikinis modified with Inoue modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein the URL and channel data are displayed in response to activation of the web-surfing button (See Discussion of claim 41).

Regarding claim **57**, Kikinis modified with Inoue modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein the control unit controls display of the information accessed from the network address through the network interface (See Kikinis Col. 8 lines 1-22).

Regarding claim **58**, Kikinis modified with Inoue modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein the accessed information includes at least one of price information, product appearance information,

a name, and a product code (See Kikinis Col. 2 lines 36-44, Col. 8 lines 23-37 The model name of a

car is both a product code and a name).

Regarding claim **59**, Kikinis modified with Inoue modified with Maa and Hidary teaches wherein

the control unit controls the screen to simultaneously display the URL and an infra-coded picture of

the channel data (See Kikinis Fig. 3A, Col. 9 lines 24-53, Col. 10 lines 5-17 MPEG frames are an

infra-coded picture).

Regarding claim **60**, Kikinis modified with Inoue modified with Maa and Hidary further teaches

the controller comprising: a frame composer which forms an item selection video frame for

allowing viewer selection of a product associated with the URL (See Kikinis Fig. 1, VGA 33, Fig. 3A

Steps 99,105 and Col. 5 lines 27-67, Col. 6 lines 1-32 Col. 9 lines 29-67 and Col. 10 lines 1-38).

3. **Claim 63 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis in view of Maa and Hidary as applied to claim 61, above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,154,771 to Rangan et al.**

Regarding claim **63**, Kikinis modified with Maa and Hidary fails to disclose wherein the data

streams are broadcast in a uni-casting format. However, Kikinis does disclose that his invention is

broad enough to encompass any means of providing TV signals for display (See Col. 11 lines 51-55)

and that his set-top box has a network interface module (See Col. 5 lines 55-67). Providing TV

signals to a set-top box in a uni-cast format through a network interface module is well known in the

as taught by Rangan (See Col. 24 lines 38-65 Video on Demand is a uni-cast format). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

further modify Kikinis' system so that TV signals were provided in a uni-casting format as taught by

Rangan to each individual subscriber could access content independently of other users.

4. **Claim 64 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis in view Maa and Hidary as applied to claim 61, above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,774,666 to Portuesi.**

Regarding claim **64**, Kikinis modified with Maa and Hidary fails to disclose wherein, when the data streams omit direct explicit information linking the program and product information, the control circuit generates explicit linking information from implicit timing information to allow the program and product information to be simultaneously displayed on the screen. In a similar endeavor, Portuesi teaches video data streams and URLs each occupying different tracks in a movie file and that the URL tracks contain timing information specifying when each URL is to be displayed and that a playback device interprets the timing information and generates video (explicit linking information) to allow program and product information to be displayed simultaneously on the screen (See Col. 4 lines 47-67 and Col. 5 lines 1-59 Col. 7 Table 2, Col. 9 lines 26-27). In this set up there is no explicit linking information in the URL track (See Cols 7 and 8 Tables showing information contained in URL track) and URLs and images are shown simultaneously (See Fig. 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Kikinis to have the data stream omit explicit linking information and have program and product information displayed simultaneously based on an implied relationship as taught by Portuesi to reduce the amount of bits in the data stream and thus conserve bandwidth required to transmitted product information (See Kikinis Col. 9 lines 29-35).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office

action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is

reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS

from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the

mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the

THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on

the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory

period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Christopher M. Lambrecht whose telephone number is (571) 272-7297. The

examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John

Miller can be reached on (571) 272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this

application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be

obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications

is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see

http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system,

contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like

assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Christopher M. Lambrecht
Examiner
Art Unit 2623

cml

JOHN MILLER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600